



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXXIV, I.

WHOLE NO. 133.

---

## I.—THE DIALOGUE OF TACITUS.

The preparation of a text and translation for the Loeb Classical Library has sent me back to the *Dialogus*. It is just twenty years since my edition was published in the Clarendon Press Series, and in the interval the literature of the subject has grown very considerably. One might almost think that our generation had deliberately set itself to make amends for the neglect of previous times. Special studies have been undertaken in the learned journals; new editions have been produced; and above all fresh light has been thrown by quite recent discoveries on some at least of the problems which have made the *Dialogus* one of the puzzles of literary antiquity. I wish to speak in this paper of what can now be called with confidence the Hersfeld archetype, and of a recent attempt to use the new evidence that has come to light in support of a textual theory which I believe to be unfounded, and which must in any case be left to rest, as formerly, on internal evidence alone.

In his monumental edition of the *Dialogus*, Gudeman followed Voigt in rejecting without hesitation (p. cxx, note 206) the tradition which ascribed the rediscovery of the minor works of Tacitus to Enoch of Ascoli. But this is a case where it would have been better not to be so positive. For not only is the tradition vindicated (and accepted now, by the way, by Gudeman himself), but a portion of the 10th century archetype recovered by Enoch at Hersfeld and brought by him to Italy has been found incorporated with a 15th century manuscript at Iesi. It seems hardly creditable to Italian scholarship that a codex so

important as that which turned up in a private library only ten years ago should have lain hid so long. If it had been reported earlier it would have saved much discussion. The incident is significant as showing that while scholars are busy looking in many lands for what is underground, some things are still to be found above the surface in Italy itself.

For the purposes of my edition published by the Oxford Press, I collated a somewhat neglected manuscript in the British Museum, the *Harleianus* 2639, containing the Suetonius fragment and the Dialogue. The fact that the Suetonius comes first in this codex did not blind me to the importance of a note which I reported (p. lxxix) as occurring at the end of the text—*Hic antiquissimum exemplar finit et hoc integrum videtur*. The obvious inference from these words was that the *Harleianus* derived, either directly or indirectly, from an ancient manuscript which must have been the archetype of the two lost codices that are known as X and Y. And as the *Harleianus* was written in Italy, it seemed reasonable to conclude that it was no mere copy of an ancient original that Enoch brought from Hersfeld, but the *antiquissimum exemplar* itself.

This view turns out now to be amply justified by the facts. The Suetonius fragment was the last of four treatises contained in the Hersfeld original, the other three being (1) The Germania, (2) The Agricola, and (3) The Dialogus. It was in 1901 that Sabbadini announced<sup>1</sup> the discovery in an Ambrosian MS. (R. 88 sup. f. 112) of certain references entered in his diary by Pier Candido Decembrio (1399–1477), about the time of Enoch's return from the mission on which he had been sent in search of manuscripts. The entry begins with the words "Cornelii taciti liber reperitur Rome visus 1455 de Origine et situ Germanie". It was in 1451 that Pope Nicholas V had sent Enoch into Northern Europe, and this note makes it certain that he was back at Rome in 1455, bringing his sheaves with him. Decembrio quotes the beginning and end of the Germania, which he describes as a codex in double columns, containing 12 folia,—"*opus est foliorum XII in columnellis*". The Agricola is next described in the same way, and is said to have been comprised in 14 folia. The account given of the Dialogus, which comes next, must be quoted almost as it stands: "Cornelii taciti dialogus de oratori-

<sup>1</sup> Rivista di fil. class. XXIX (1901) p. 262 sq.

bus. Incipit: *Sepe ex me requiris . . . . oratoris retineat*: Opus foliorum XIII in columnellis. Post hec deficiunt sex folia. nam finit: *quam ingentibus verbis prosequuntur*.<sup>1</sup> *Cum ad veros iudices ventum*. Deinde sequitur: *rem cogitare nihil abiectum nihil humile*. Post hec sequuntur folia duo cum dimidio, et finit: *Cum adrisissent discessimus*".

The fourth and last treatise is described as "Suetonii tranquilli de grammaticis et rhetoribus liber", in seven folia. In connection with an argument which will be developed later, it may be important to remark here that in citing the concluding portion of this treatise Decembrio must have read clearly in his archetype the words *proconsulem* and *conspectu*, which afterwards became corrupted, the former into *personalem* A B, and the latter into *ypseum* A, *ipseu* B. This suggests that the compendia which have been noted as characteristic of the text may have been due, not to the Hersfeld archetype, but to X, the lost original of A and B.

The discovery of Decembrio's note would have sufficed to vindicate the tradition of Enoch's connection with the Hersfeld codex. But the sequel is even more remarkable. Only a year or two after Sabbadini made his communication, the discovery was announced (as a matter of fact, at the International Congress of Historians held at Rome in 1903) in the library of Count Guglielmi-Balleani at Iesi, in the district of Ancona, of a 15th century codex in which is incorporated a portion (one whole quaternion) of the *Agricola*, which obviously formed part of the "antiquissimum exemplar" brought from Hersfeld to Rome in 1455.<sup>2</sup>

The new evidence is being invoked to settle two important textual problems, first the extent and nature of the great lacuna at the end of ch. 35, and secondly the suggestion, which has received much support, that a second lacuna must be assumed in the text after the words *faces admovebant* in 40, 7 (Teubner text). It seems to me that in regard to the former of these two problems no certain result has yet been reached, while as to the second the facts have been altogether wrongly interpreted.

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally this establishes the reading *prosequuntur* (*prosequuntur* A B E V<sup>2</sup>: *persequuntur* H V: *persequimur* D: *persequuntur* C Δ).

<sup>2</sup> See Annibaldi, *L'Agricola e La Germania di Cornelio Tacito nel MS. Latino N. 8 della biblioteca del Conte G-Balleani in Iesi, Città di Castello, 1907*, and the same editor's *La Germania*, Leipzig, 1910; also Wissowa's preface to the Leiden facsimile (Sijthoff, Leiden, 1907).

Let me take the second first. The view set forth in the introduction to my edition of the Dialogue is the traditional and conservative one, viz: that chs. 36 to 41 form a continuous whole and must be credited to one speaker, Maternus. That there are repetitions in his discourse, and even redundancies, must be admitted; the speaker shows that he is conscious of them himself (e. g. *ut subinde admoneo* 37, 31), and they seem to have been motivated by what had been said, probably by Secundus as well as by Messalla, in that part of the debate which has been lost in the great lacuna. But the critics go too far in my opinion when they speak of contradictions<sup>1</sup> in addition to repetitions,—some of them even vainly endeavoring to make out that there are inconsistencies between what Maternus says here of the scope of republican oratory and the ideal which he describes in the speech he made at the opening of the discussion on the comparative merits of oratory and poetry.

Now as to the MS. evidence. In Classical Philology, Vol. 7, No. 4, pages 412-419 (October, 1912,) Dr. Alfred Gudeman sets forth what he believes to be an "amazing confirmation" of the theory that a second lacuna must be assumed in the text after ch. 40, 7. It is well known that such lacunae do not usually occur at the end of a sentence, as is the case here, and the theory in question would be greatly strengthened if it were possible to show that the words "*faces admovebant*", which close the sentence, occurred at the foot of the verso of a page in the archetype; the loss of the succeeding folio may easily then have given rise to a lacuna not noticed by the next copyist,—especially if he found the following page beginning with the new sentence, *Non de otiosa*, etc., which of course is pure supposition. In order to furnish the necessary proof Dr. Gudeman assumes that the words with which ch. 36 now begins, "*Rem cogitant*", were at the beginning of the page in the archetype which followed the great lacuna. This assumption (unlike the one in regard to *Non de otiosa*, etc.) he is probably entitled to make, as the most likely theory about the great lacuna is that it was caused by the actual loss or the total disfigurement of certain complete folia in the original.

<sup>1</sup> The best statement of the argument under this head will be found in the Preface to the edition by C. John (Weidmann, Berlin, 1899) p. 39 sqq. See on the other hand my edition, Introd. p. xxxviii sqq.; and cp. Hendrickson in Am. J. Ph. xvi (1895) pp. 84-86.

Arguing from these premises Dr. Gudeman takes the diplomatic edition of the text of the *Agricola* published by Annibaldi, and founds on it his alleged proof that the portion of the Dialogue from ch. 36 to "faces admovebant" at ch. 40, 7, would make exactly two folia or four pages of the archetype. Having presented the case so that we are bound to suppose that a leaf may have been accidentally lost "at the precise juncture where the strongest of internal reasons pointed to an interruption of the context" he calls it a "coincidence too marvelous for credence", and proceeds to establish the theory by the processes of arithmetic. I shall not be doing Dr. Gudeman any injustice if I briefly summarize his argument as follows: An average page of the *Agricola* MS. as printed in Annibaldi's diplomatic reproduction contained 282 cm. of text. Two folia, therefore, or four pages, would contain 1128 cm. of text. Now the entire length of the text of the Dialogue as printed in the Teubner edition from chs. 36 to 40, 7 is 1025.4 cm.,<sup>1</sup> but as 1 cm. of this edition is equal to 1.1 cm. of the archetype the same amount of text covered 1127.94 cm. in the MS. "Dividing this total by 282, the number of cm. to a page, we find that chs. 36 to 40, 6 [7] took up 3,999, or exactly 4 complete pages in the codex Hersfeldensis". If this calculation were correct Dr. Gudeman might certainly be excused for regarding the fractional difference as quite insignificant, amounting as it does to less than a single letter. He would have proved in fact that, as the verso of the second folio must have finished with the words *faces admovebant* at 40, 7, the lacuna postulated at that point in the text by Heumann, Andresen, John, and others must have been caused by the actual loss of a leaf or leaves in the archetype.

Unfortunately the calculation does not hold. In the first place let me call attention to the fact that it is based on averages, a somewhat slender foundation for a process claiming such arithmetical exactitude. The Teubner text is of course a known quantity: a full line measures 8.5 cm. But the case is different with the written text of the *Agricola* as it is preserved for us in the surviving quaternion of the archetype now found imbedded

<sup>1</sup> I am giving Dr. Gudeman the benefit of his own figures, but am bound at the same time to report that my measurements are different. Taking the Teubner text as it is printed in the 1901 edition I find 127 full lines (plus four spaces for capital letters) from ch. 36 to ch. 40, 7, and this gives at 8.5 cm. per line 1079.5 cm., not 1025.4.

in the codex Aesinus, which, by the way, does not yield the same measurements as Annibaldi's diplomatic reproduction. Dr. Gudeman gets his 282 cm. per page by calculating the length of a column line in Annibaldi's printed text as varying from 4.4 to 4.85 cm. or of a double line as varying between 8.8 and 9.7 cm., the grand average being 9.4 cm. As there are 30 lines to the page he multiplies 9.4 by 30 and gets 282.

Believing Gudeman's results to be as important as they are certainly remarkable, I set about to verify them, and resolved not to rely upon averages for the MS. lines as reproduced by Annibaldi, but to proceed by the method of actual measurement of his text. I find that the content of each of the 16 pages which make up the quaternion varies from 276.1 to 303.5 cm., and that the average is therefore not 282 cm., but 290.1, which would give nearly one Teubner line more for each page, and which for the four pages taken together increases the resulting difference from the single letter reported by Gudeman to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  Teubner lines, at the very least.

This, however, while establishing a doubt, would not in itself be sufficient to dispose of Dr. Gudeman's argument. The variations of script from one page to another of a manuscript are known to be considerable, and *on the supposition that* the copyist of the Dialogue was the same as the copyist of the Agricola, or at least that he was writing in the same style, it may be admitted that the text of chs. 36 to 40, 7 would go *approximately* into four pages of the MS.<sup>1</sup>

But the next consideration which I have to bring forward is altogether fatal to Dr. Gudeman's theory. The note in Decembrio's diary states that in the archetype the great lacuna was followed by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  folia, or five pages: "post hec sequuntur folia duo cum dimidio. et finit: *Cum adrisissent discessimus*". Four of these five pages Gudeman has accounted for by supposing that they contained the text of the Dialogue from chs. 36 to 40, 7. We have thus one page left. But the remaining text of

<sup>1</sup>My calculation is that the Agricola quaternion is contained in 491 *full* lines of the Teubner text. Two folia (or a quarter of a quaternion) would therefore go into  $122\frac{3}{4}$  lines. As a matter of fact there are 127 full Teubner lines from ch. 36 to 40, 7, which would go into two folia if we allow  $31\frac{3}{4}$  Teubner lines to each page here, instead of  $30\frac{3}{4}$  lines, which is the average for the Agricola quaternion. It may be noted that there are more chapters in the Agricola text, while the Dialogue is more continuous.

the Dialogue cannot by any stretch, either of imagination or of arithmetic, go into one page calculated on the same basis as the other four. My estimate is that with a colophon three folia, or six full pages, of the Agricola type would be needed to take in the 182 Teubner lines of the Dialogue from ch. 36 to the end. This is inconsistent with Decembrio's note, "folia duo cum dimidio", which we must take to be correct. Gudeman's arithmetical processes must be applied to the fifth page equally with the other four, and the grounds on which he bases what he calls a "surprising result" in regard to these are found completely to collapse when we come to deal with the remainder of the text.

The possibility may occur to some that Decembrio may have given an inaccurate report when he wrote "folia duo cum dimidio", and that he may have failed to include in his reckoning what may have been the verso of a leaf immediately preceding, making six pages in all instead of five. This would involve the explanation that the great lacuna was caused not by the actual loss of folia, but by their disfigurement, and that the text again becomes legible on the verso of the *sixth* page (post hec deficiunt *sex folia*), beginning with the words "rem cogitant". Such a hypothesis, while it would find room for the remainder of the text, is excluded by a fresh proof which may be held to point in a different direction in any attempt to estimate for the lost archetype of the Dialogue the amount of Teubner text that may have gone to the MS. page. Decembrio's note says that the Germania was contained in 12 folia, reproduced in the *codex Aesinus* by only 10 folia.<sup>1</sup> We need not have any difficulty here in accepting Decembrio's statement as absolutely correct. A comparison of the Germania text with the surviving quaternion of the Agricola makes it easily possible to reconstruct the archetype on the basis of Decembrio's 12 folia. Decembrio's note tells us next that the Agricola was contained in 14 folia. There is more difficulty here, but the important fact to note is that while the body of the work surviving in the old quaternion (13.2—40.6) is fully accounted for, and while careful calculation shows that the first four folia, no

<sup>1</sup> The copyist of the Germania in the *codex Aesinus* got  $6\frac{1}{4}$  additional Teubner lines into what is now 69<sup>r</sup>; if he did the same, as seems to be the fact, in each of his ten folia, or twenty pages, he would gain about 125 lines—just the equivalent of the two folia by which he reduced the size of the archetype.



longer extant, must have been written on pretty much the same scale, the case is different with the last two folia. It may even be significant that the last pages of the old quaternion have a somewhat larger content than most of the others. The seventh folio (63) has 291 cm. on the recto, and on the verso 297.9. The eighth (63) has on the recto 300.6 cm. and on the verso 294.5. Then follows a very considerable jump. Fortunately for us what was originally page 64 of the *Agricola* is still preserved, the writing having first been erased for the purpose of receiving the text of the *Germania*, where it is now page 69. In regard to this page the fact becomes of first-class importance that its content was greater than that of the *Agricola* pages upon which Gudeman's whole argument is based by no fewer than  $6\frac{1}{2}$  additional Teubner lines. In centimetres the increase is from 294.5 in 63<sup>v</sup> to 352.3 in 64<sup>r</sup>. The erased portion of the *Agricola* contained 37 lines of Teubner text<sup>1</sup> and the portion of the *Germania* substituted for it, as may be seen from the facsimile given in Annibaldi's edition, has just about the same amount. Annibaldi in fact has already noted (see his *Germania*, page 24), "*that the script of the last pages of the Agricola was different from that of the preserved quaternion; it was finer and closer and each line, therefore, contained a larger number of letters*". In his opinion, we have here a clear case of a different hand.

For the *Dialogue* these observations come to have the highest possible significance. Taking 290.1 as the average number of cm. for each page of the old quaternion, we are able to square our calculations with Decembrio's note, both for the preceding part of the *Agricola* and for the whole of the *Germania*. In the old quaternion there are 491 full Teubner lines. This gives an average of  $30\frac{2}{3}$  lines for every page of the MS. But towards the end of the quaternion, as remarked above, and still more after it, conditions begin to change. The first folio after the quaternion (64<sup>r</sup>) we find to have contained no fewer than 37 lines of the Teubner text of the *Agricola*. Following Annibaldi, who makes his calculations on the basis of the erasures still traceable in the MS., I am able to report that the original 64<sup>v</sup> con-

<sup>1</sup> Annibaldi tells us that page 64<sup>r</sup> of the original *Agricola* text, now erased, contained the parts from *ad Agricolam* in 40, 6 to *qui iturus* in 42, 4,—fully 37 Teubner lines. Compare his *L'Agricola*, etc. (1907), p. 138, with the facsimile given in his more recent *Germania* (1910).

tained 32 lines and 65 35 lines of Teubner text, while the last page of all, 65<sup>v</sup>, has 32 lines even without the colophon.

The bearing of these calculations on the Dialogue is this. Decembrio's note states that up to the great lacuna the text of this treatise was contained in 14 folia, or 28 pages. These pages must have been similar in character, not—as Gudeman wrongly imagines—to those folia of the *Agricola* which had the least content, but to those which had the greatest. We have seen how Gudeman's calculation breaks down entirely in regard to the last 2½ folia of the Dialogue, and it is found to be equally inapplicable to the first 14. I estimate that not 14 folia, but at the very least 15½ (with some additional space for capital letters), would be required for the amount of Teubner text that comes before the great lacuna, calculated at anything like 290.1 cm. to the manuscript page and say 30⅔ lines of Teubner text. This may be shown by the following proof: The *Agricola* quaternion contains, as has been said, 491 full lines of Teubner text; this gives us 122⅔ lines for 2 folia, or 4 pages. Multiplying by 7 to get Decembrio's fourteen folia we get 859½ Teubner lines, or with a deduction for the space that would be occupied by the title of the Dialogue, say, 850 lines. But the Dialogue contains, up to the great lacuna, 939 full lines of Teubner text, and we are therefore left with a residuum of 89 lines,—pretty nearly the equivalent of 1½ folia, or three pages, making 15½ folia in all. For the first 14 folia of the Dialogue it becomes necessary therefore to postulate an archetype which contained the equivalent of 34 full Teubner lines to the page, instead of 30⅔, as in the case of the *Agricola* quaternion. Our conclusion must be that the Dialogue was written in the style of the last two folia of the *Agricola*, and not in that of the extant quaternion.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover the same argument holds also in regard to the Suetonius fragment, which must have been written in pretty much the same script as the Dialogue—certainly not in that of the

<sup>1</sup> A minor proof of this conclusion may be cited here. In quoting from the Dialogue to show where the lacuna begins, Decembrio's note contains the words *quam ingentibus verbis prosequuntur. Cum ad veros iudices ventum . . .* Here *quam* is for *numquam*—the *num* having formed part of the previous line. I therefore take *quam . . . prosequuntur* as having formed one line in the archetype. With the usual contraction, *ingentib.*, this line contains 30 letters, which is the normal number, as may be seen from Annibaldi's facsimile of 69<sup>r</sup>.

Agricola quaternion. Decembrio's note assigns to it seven folia, and indicates that it finished abruptly with only a few lines in the last column. Now, whereas the Agricola quaternion contains about 491 full Teubner lines, the Suetonius fragment has considerably over 500, and these would certainly have required at least a full quaternion (i. e. 16 pages and more, instead of less than 14) if they had been written in the same style.<sup>1</sup>

We may now take our main conclusion as sufficiently established. There were two hands, not one, in the Hersfeldensis, and Gudeman's laborious argument, depending as it does on identity or the closest similarity of script, falls to the ground.

The two folios that were added to the third quaternion to complete the Agricola are an important factor in the new statement of the case. They are almost enough in themselves to invalidate the assumption that one and the same scribe was entrusted with the making of the whole codex. In that case, he would infallibly have carried forward the text of the Agricola into the fourth quaternion, in which he had to copy the Dialogus. He would, in fact, have made his transcript continuous. If the Agricola had been the last of the four treatises comprised in the Hersfeldensis, instead of the second, the addition of two folia to complete the text, instead of a new quaternion, would have been quite intelligible. But Decembrio's note is decisive on this point. It describes the codex as he saw it in Rome in 1455. I do not attach much importance to the fact that (Wissowa, p. ii) the inventory supplied to Poggio by the Hersfeld monk, as quoted by Antonius Panormita in 1426, shows the treatise of Frontinus "*de aquae ductibus*" intervening between the Agricola and the Dialogus. The citation is faulty in other respects. The important point for us is that it confirms the order of the treatises as given in Decembrio's note—(1) Germania, (2) Agricola, (3) Dialogus, (4) Suetonius. Otherwise we might have been inclined to suspect, from the order in which they occur in many MSS., that

<sup>1</sup> Another method of stating the argument is to take the Leiden facsimile, and note that whereas the fourteen folios of the Dialogus in the Hersfeld original need over 48 pages in the Leidensis (and correspondingly the "*folia duo cum dimidio*" more than 8 pages, and the seven Suetonius folios 25, counting the index), no more than 32 pages are required to contain all the 12 folios of the Germania. If the Leidensis had contained the Agricola, it would have given its 14 folia in about 38 pages, as against 48 for the corresponding number of Dialogus folios.

the Suetonius originally came first.<sup>1</sup> In any case the *Dialogus* and Suetonius portion was evidently regarded as easily detachable from the rest. These treatises are reproduced in several 15th century MSS. independently of the *Germania* and the *Agricola*. They are not included in the codex Aesinus. The inference must be that they were irrecoverably separated from the rest of the *Hersfeldensis* soon after its reappearance at Rome. The next owner of the codex after Enoch's death in 1457 was Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pius II (Wissowa, p. ix), and he seems to have kept as firm a hold on his property as Enoch himself had done. If he had permitted copies to be made, the *Agricola* would have come to light sooner than it did. As a matter of fact it is not included in either A or B, or even in the editio Spirensis, 1470. If a further separation had taken place, and if the *Agricola* had been detached from the *Germania*, that would help to explain how the last four folia of the latter treatise and the first four of the *Agricola* came to be separate—as we can see from the Iesi reproduction must have been the case. They formed, in fact, the second quaternion of the *Hersfeldensis*, which would have to be cut in two to effect the separation.

But all this is speculation, and nothing short of the recovery of the lost portions of the *Hersfeldensis* could set the remaining questions at rest. We have seen that there must have been two scribes. Were they contemporary, or is it conceivable that the *Hersfeld* codex was composite, consisting of two portions, one written in the 10th and the other in the 13th century? An affirmative answer would make the transmission of the *Dialogus*, under the name of Tacitus, a greater mystery than ever. It would probably have to imply that a copyist in the 13th century added two folia to complete the text of a 10th century MS. of the *Agricola*, and then went on to transcribe the *Dialogus* and the Suetonius from some unknown original.

It must suffice to state the conundrum without any further attempt to answer it. Annibaldi describes the two additional *Agricola* folios, which are now palimpsest, as considerably worn away and thinned by the process of rubbing, but he does not suggest any doubt as to their being an integral and original part

<sup>1</sup> The note in the Harleianus would still be quite appropriate, as indicating that there was no more of the Suetonius in the "antiquissimum exemplar", and that the text was complete ("hoc integrum videtur").

of the 10th century Hersfeldensis. The 15th century copyist of the Aesinus used them, in accordance with a common practice, as an outside cover to stiffen the paper quires of his Germania.

The only argument derivable from internal evidence that can be adduced in favor of the theory here broached is that editors have inferred, as a rule, from the condition of the text both of the *Dialogus* and of the *Suetonius*, that the archetype must have abounded in the compendia that were characteristic of the 13th century, whereas the 10th century script in which the *Agricola* quaternion is written is singularly free from any except the usual contractions. I have suggested, on the other hand (p. 3), that the compendia in question may have been due, not to the archetype, but to one of the very few copies which its owner permitted to be transcribed directly from it. To speak more particularly of the *Dialogus*. All the existing 15th century MSS. are understood to have been derived from the Hersfeldensis through two intermediaries, X and Y, which are no longer extant. If what I may call the 2d portion of the Hersfeld codex was 13th century, there would be room for mistakes. On the other hand the large number of variants, traceable to compendia, that are found in a codex like the *Vaticanus D*, may be explained by the assumption that these compendia originated in some intermediate copy: the only puzzle is how a current script of the 15th century can have presented any real difficulty.

I have left myself scarcely any room to speak of the second problem of the *Dialogue*, the length of the great lacuna. It is faithfully indicated in all the manuscripts, and the question is whether it occurred originally in the Hersfeld codex itself or in some predecessor. In the former case we should now be in a position to determine the real extent of the existing gap: in the latter, we should still be left to conjecture.

Here again the new factor in the problem is Decembrio's note. He tells us that there were 14 folia up to the words *Cum ad veros iudices ventum* in which the lacuna begins (ch. 35) and adds "Post hec deficient sex<sup>1</sup> folia . . . Deinde sequitur: '*rem*

<sup>1</sup> Students of the text of the *Dialogus* will note Decembrio's agreement here with the Y tradition in *cogitare* and *nihil* (for *cogitant* and *vel* in X). The transposition of the vulgate *nihil humile nihil abiectum* may be explained either as a reminiscence of Cicero (see my note *ad loc.*) or as the result of an

*cogitare nihil abiectum, nihil humile*'. Post hec sequuntur folia duo cum dimidio et finit: *Cum adrisissent discessimus*".

This is a very definite statement by a careful observer, and it must mean that the lacuna began after the 14th folio, which must have been the 6th folio of the 5th quaternion in the Hersfeldensis. Moreover if we are to interpret Decembrio's note as meaning that the codex had  $16\frac{1}{2}$  folia and was minus 6, it is easy to calculate that the lacuna amounts to  $\frac{4}{15}$  of the whole treatise, or rather more than one-fourth.

On the other hand the Vatican codex 1862 (A), has the marginal note "*hic desunt sex pagelle*", and the Leidensis (B) "*deerant in exemplari sex pagellae vetustate consumptae*". I call attention to the difference (though there may be very little in it) between B's *deerant* and the present tense *deficiunt*, and *desunt* in the other two notes. The use of the present seems to point (certainly in the case of Decembrio) to first-hand observation, whereas B is generally believed<sup>1</sup> to be a copy, not of the Hersfeld archetype, but of the transcript from that original made by Pontanus, to whom we must also attribute the words "*vetustate consumptae*". It is difficult to account for the discrepancy between "*folia*" on the one hand and "*pagellae*" on the other: if it is an affair of single pages, the extent of the lacuna may obviously be reduced by one-half.<sup>2</sup> But was the missing portion indicated only by a note in the Hersfeld original, or were the

---

unintentional omission in the archetype in consequence of which one of the two *nihil* clauses was added above the line and was taken in by Decembrio at the wrong place.

<sup>1</sup> Massmann's view, however (see his edition of the Germania, 1847), that the Leiden MS. was written by Pontanus himself, has recently been revived. I am informed by Prof. B. L. Ullman of the University of Pittsburgh that he has made a special study of this problem, and that he believes that most of the corrections and marginal notes in the Leiden MS. as well as those in other MSS. known to have been written by the same copyist, are all in the same hand as the text, viz., that of Pontanus. The text is in his most formal style, while the notes vary considerably. It should be stated also, as against Wissowa, that *excripsit* in the note on f. 47<sup>v</sup> of the Leiden codex (Iov. Pontanus Umber excripsit) means 'copied', not 'composed'.

<sup>2</sup> The number six is vouched for not only by Decembrio's note (*sex folia*), but also by A B and E (*sex paginae*, or *pagellae*). On the other hand, when the copyist of Ven. says '*hic deficiunt quattuor parvae pagellae*', it is obvious that the reference is to the MS. from which he was making his transcript.

folia actually there, though in such a condition that they could not be read? Wissowa takes the former view, holding that the loss of the folia had already occurred in a predecessor of the Hersfeldensis. This enables him to reconstruct the second part of the archetype in three quaternions—16 folia for the Dialogue, with the last page on 1<sup>r</sup> of the third quaternion, and the remaining 7 folia of that quaternion for the Suetonius fragment. I find great difficulty in accepting this reconstruction. It would of course dispose, more effectively than ever—so far as the Hersfeld codex is concerned—of the hypothesis of a second lacuna after 40, 7, because if all the folia in that codex are accounted for in this way none can have been lost. But if it is correct, what are we to make of Pontanus's description of the archetype? In another note on the verso of the 47th page of the Leidensis, he makes a further contribution to our knowledge of its condition, speaking again of Enoch's search for *libri*, and referring obviously to the Hersfeld archetype: "hos quanquam mendosos et imperfectos ad nos retulit". If the codex Hersfeldensis was complete as regards its external form, and if the great lacuna which it had inherited from its predecessor was indicated only by a marginal note, why did Pontanus use such epithets as "mendosos" and "imperfectos"? And what is the meaning of 'vetustate consumptae' in the marginal note in B at the end of ch. 35?

It seems far more probable that the defective portion of the Dialogue was actually contained in the archetype as brought from Hersfeld to Rome, but in such a state of disfigurement and mutilation that the folia could not be deciphered by a transcriber. The description of the codex given by Pontanus would seem to be too strongly colored if its main defect consisted merely in the fact that the Suetonius fragment finished abruptly in an uncompleted column,—with another note by Pontanus in the margin of his copy,

"Amplius repertum non est adhuc".

W. PETERSON.